



3-602

ifw 2625  
5673 Gibraltar Dr. Suite #150  
Pleasanton, CA 94588



Main 925.251.6300  
Fax 925.416.8600  
www.visioneer.com

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria VA 22313-1450

Attn: Examiner Negussie Worku

Via Express Mail  
March 5, 2007

Re: Appl. No.: 09/924,227  
Applicant(s): Blair et al  
Filed: August 7, 2001

Dear Examiner Worku:

Enclosed please find an Amendment in response to your non-final Office Action dated 12/12/2006.

Per your request, a drawing has been provided which indicates connectivity between the inventive device (scanner) and a computer. Further, a Substitute Specification is also provided in order to address the cancelled and withdrawn claims in this Application. Claims have been briefly amended and a clean copy of the Specification is provided in addition to the marked up version.

Thank you in advance for your attention to this matter, and please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

Ron van Os  
*Applicant/Inventor*

Enclosures: Amendment



Application/Control Number: 09/924,227

March 4, 2007

Art Unit 2626

First Named Inventor: Blair, John

Examiner: Worku, Negussie

**Amendment and Reply to Non-Final Office Action Rejecting Claims and Objecting to Drawings**

Dear Examiner Worku:

Per your second non-final Office Action mailing date 12/12/06, herein is a response to claim rejections and objection to the drawings.

First, it is prefaced that a Substitute Specification has been provided, which provides more clarity regarding the invention pursuant to the withdrawn and cancelled claims, and provides a clearer view of what is currently being claimed. Claims have also been amended to further that clarity and remove basis for rejections, and one new Figure has been added per your request for specificity of interconnection of apparatus.

Claims 1-8 are rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kagami, et al. (5,532,844), in view of Kadota (6,697,073). In your Action you indicate that Kagami does not teach or disclose a computer being connected to at least one USB port of a computer, while Kadota does teach such a connection. The USB connection is not the novel aspect of the present application. Figures are attached herein which illustrate with clarity the differences between the two reference patents and the present Application. These Figures are notated Exhibits A, B, and C.

Exhibit A, the present Application, illustrates the novel invention, which is a flatbed scanner with one or more card reader slots integrated directly into the scanner. Exhibit B, the Kagami patent, illustrates merely the connection of a split external hub which may be connected to both a printer and a scanner. The Kagami reference has no relation to a scanner housing its own internal data card reader slots. Exhibit C, the Kadota reference, illustrates the relationship between a USB port and an external hub being connected to an external device and/or another hub. Again, no relation to a scanner having internal data card reader slots.

The inventive Application is most clearly differentiated by attention to the drawings of what the reference patents cover, and what the present invention details. There cannot be an obviousness assertion that internal data card reader slots would be inferred by either §103 reference. The technologies are completely different from the present invention, though they are similar to themselves and indeed may have represented prior art arguments as against only the two reference patents. They, in combination, do